## Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

HERNANDEZ,

v.

Defendant.

UNKNOWN,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA
1	
Z,	Case No. <u>20-cv-09306-HSG</u>
Plaintiff,	ORDER OF DISMISSAL

On December 23, 2020, Plaintiff filed a letter describing concerns about conditions of confinement. Dkt. No. 1. The Court construed this letter as an attempt to file a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. That same day, the Clerk of the Court informed Plaintiff that this action was deficient because she had not paid the filing fee and had not submitted her complaint on the proper form. Dkt. Nos. 2, 3. Plaintiff was instructed to respond within twenty-eight days of the date of the order. Dkt. Nos. 2, 3. The deadline has passed, and Plaintiff has neither paid the filing fee nor submitted a complaint on the proper form, or otherwise communicated with the Court. The Court therefore DISMISSES this action without prejudice. Because this dismissal is without prejudice, Plaintiff may move to reopen the action. Any such motion must be accompanied by both a complaint on the proper form, and an *in forma pauperis* application on the proper form, with the required supporting documents. The Clerk shall enter judgment and close the file.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 3/9/2021

United States District Judge